



OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

January 23, 2003

Mr. Clyde A. Pine, Jr.  
Mounce, Green, Myers, Safi & Galatzan, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1977  
El Paso, Texas 79950-1977

OR2003-0483

Dear Mr. Pine:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 175446.

The El Paso Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a proposal for certain third party administrator and network services pursuant to Request for Proposal No. 47-02. You state that you notified the third party bidder, Assured Benefits Administrators, of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Public Information Act in certain circumstances). You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by Assured Benefits Administrators. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305.

Initially, we must address the district's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Under section 552.301(e), a governmental body receiving an open records request for information that it wishes to withhold pursuant to one of the exceptions to public disclosure is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. The district did not submit a copy of the written request for information to this office.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.--Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Section 552.104 is a discretionary exception under the Public Information Act and may be waived by the governmental body. Thus, this exception does not demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information from the public. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104). A compelling interest can be demonstrated, however, where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). We will therefore address your claim under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

We note that Assured Benefits Administrators and the district both state that the company's contractual information is subject to a confidentiality agreement. However, information that is subject to disclosure under the Public Information Act may not be withheld simply because the party submitting it anticipates or requests confidentiality. A governmental body's promise to keep information confidential is not a basis for withholding that information from the public, unless the governmental body has specific authority to keep the information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under the [predecessor to the Public Information] act cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988)."); *see also Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976) (governmental agency may not bring information within scope of predecessor to section 552.101 of Government Code by promulgation of rule; to imply such authority merely from general rule-making powers would be to allow agency to circumvent very purpose of predecessor to Public Information Act), *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Goldston*, 957 S.W.2d 671, 673 (Tex. App.--Fort Worth 1997, pet. denied) ("Because venue is fixed by law, any agreement or contract whereby the parties try to extend or restrict venue is void as against public policy.") Consequently, the requested information must fall within an exception to disclosure in order to be withheld.

The district states that the proposal submitted by Assured Benefits Administrators is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Public Information Act (the "Act") is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records

Decision No. 552 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Upon review, we find that the district and Assured Benefits Administrators have not demonstrated that any portion of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). We further find that Assured Benefits Administrators has provided general, conclusory statements that release of the information would be inimical to its business interests. Moreover, Assured Benefits Administrators has not substantiated its comments with any specific factual evidence. Thus, we are unable to determine that section 552.110(b) applies to the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999), 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts was entirely too speculative); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor). Accordingly, we conclude that the requested information may not be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code and must be released to the requestor in its entirety.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney

general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 175446

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. David Wysong  
Access HealthSource, Inc.  
7100 Westwind Drive  
El Paso, Texas 79912  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joe Halow  
Assured Benefits Administrators  
4100 Rio Bravo, Suite 211  
El Paso, Texas 79902  
(w/o enclosures)